



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/711,648	11/13/2000	Dean M. Ponzi	37646/KMO/W112	7874
23363	7590	12/29/2003	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP 350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD SUITE 500 PASADENA, CA 91105			SIRMONS, KEVIN C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	
			DATE MAILED: 12/29/2003	

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/711,648

Applicant(s)

PONZI ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin C. Simons

Art Unit

3763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 10.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5-12, 23, 25 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Edwards et al U.S. Pat. No. 5,370,675.

Edwards discloses an injection catheter comprising: a catheter body comprising a flexible tubing having proximal and distal ends and at least one lumen therethrough (48, 154, 184, 208, 300); a tip section comprising a flexible tubing having proximal and distal ends, wherein the proximal end of the tip section is mounted at the distal end of the catheter body (50, fig. 11, 186, 304)); a needle control handle at the proximal end of the catheter body (figs. 11-12, 14, 18, 26, 32-32); an injection needle extending through the tip section, catheter body, and needle control handle and having proximal end attached to the needle control handle and a distal end within the tip section, wherein the injection needle is longitudinally slidable within the tip section so that its distal end can extend out the distal end of the catheter upon suitable manipulation of the needle control handle (col. 14, lines 54-60, note it is the examiner's position that although not shown (figs. 4-10) inherently has a needle control handle with a proximal end attached to the needle control handle); and an electrode lead wire having a first end electrically connected to the injection needle and a second end electrically connected to a suitable monitoring apparatus or to a source of ablation energy (figs. 4-18, 26, 32-34 and the entire specification);

Art Unit: 3763

as to claims 5, 6, 7, 8 (see above listed figures); and as to claims 9-12, (see above rejection); as to claims 23, 25, 27 and 28 (see above rejection); and as to claim 29, (fig. 4, 9, 10, 14-16). As to applicant's amendment to claims 1 and 9, (col. 14, lines 53-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-4 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Edwards et al U.S. Pat. No. 5,370,675.

Edwards discloses an injection catheter substantially as claimed however, it may not be clear to someone who is not of ordinary skill in the art that the first end of the electrode lead wire is connected near the proximal end or distal end of the injection needle. Therefore, it is the position of the examiner that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a proximal and/or distal wire connection, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70. As to claims 4 and 26, (col. 42-63).

Claims 12-20 and 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards U.S. Pat. No. 5,370,675 in view of Edwards U.S. Pat. No. 5,599,294.

Art Unit: 3763

Edward discloses an injection catheter substantially as claimed except for disclosing a method for introducing a therapeutic or diagnostic agent into heart tissue of a patient.

Edwards discloses a method of using an injection catheter for introducing therapeutic or diagnostic agent into the heart tissue of a patient (col. 5). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Edwards device in the heart since Edwards (294) discloses that it would be readily apparent to a person skilled in the art that the device and method can be used to destroy body tissues in areas other than the prostate such as the brain, heart and/or other body cavities and tissue locations that are accessible by percutaneous or endoscopic catheters. Application of the device and method in all of these organs and tissues are intended to be included within the scope of this invention. As to claims 13 and 15, (col. 13, lines 5-18) and (col. 14, lines 1-11); as to claim 14, (see above rejection); as to claim 16, col. 3; as to claim 17-20 and 30-35, (see above rejections).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., that the needle is longitudinally slidable within the tip section so that the distal end can extend out of **the distal end of the catheter, emphasis added**) are clearly recited in the rejected claim(s) and clearly shown in the prior art reference.

Art Unit: 3763


Edwards discloses a catheter (48, 154, 184, 208 and 300) with a distal end. Edwards discloses a tip section (50, Fig. 11, 186 and 304).

As one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize that the needle is longitudinally slidable within the tip section (50, Fig. 11, 186 and 304) so that its distal end can extend out the distal end of the catheter (48, 154, 184, 208 and 300), as presently claimed. Note: the claims do not require the distal end of the injection needle to be longitudinally slidable within the tip section so that its distal end can extend out of the distal end of the tip section upon suitable manipulation of the needle control handle. The claims only require that the injection needle is longitudinally slidable within the tip section so that its distal end can extend out of the distal end of the catheter. This argument currently applies to claim 23.

As to claims 1 and 9, Edwards clearly discloses that the needles are longitudinally slidable within the tip section (col. 14, lines 53-60) so that its distal end can extend out of the distal end of the catheter and the distal end of the tip section.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kevin C. Sirmons whose telephone number is (703) 306-5410. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday from 6:30 am to 4:00 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.


Kevin C. Sirmons
Patent Examiner
12/22/03